



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,608	03/18/2004	Kirsten Renick	501315.01 (30299/US)	9553

7590 04/04/2007  
Edward W. Bulchis, Esq.  
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP  
Suite 3400  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98101

EXAMINER

LEE, CHUN KUAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2181

MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE

04/04/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Interview Summary

Application No.

10/804,608

Applicant(s)

RENICK, KIRSTEN

Examiner

Chun-Kuan (Mike) Lee

Art Unit

2181

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Donald Sparks (SPE).

(3) Edward Bulchis (Attorney Reg# 26,847).

(2) Chun-Kuan (Mike) Lee (Examiner).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 29 March 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 12.

Identification of prior art discussed: Caldara et al. (US Patent 5,748,629).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Please see Continuation Sheet below.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
DONALD SPARKS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

#### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

The interview mainly discussed regarding Caldara et al. (US Patent 5,748,629) is nonanalogous art. The applicant argued that Caldara is nonanalogous art because Caldara is solving a different problem than Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). In general applicant argued that Caldara is solving the problem associated with arbitration whereas the AAPA is solving the problem of bandwidth optimization, and the reason that Caldara is solving a different is because Caldara's does not have the following:

- parallel arrival of data
- variable number of data bits
- unfilled block (i.e. unused bandwidth) due to the receiving of variable number of data bits.


The examiner initially clarifies that the examiner relied on AAPA (Drawings Fig. 1-2) for rejecting almost all the claimed limitations of independent claim 1, and the claimed limitation that is not disclosed by AAPA is the organization of the lane groups so that all of the lanes in each group lane are filled up with either command header bits or data bits. Examiner then relies on Caldara for the teaching of dynamic reallocation of available bandwidth for the transferring of another cell (col. 1, l. 64 to col. 2, l. 8; col. 4, ll. 25-28; col. 6, ll. 11-17 and col. 7, ll. 10-18), therefore Caldara's teaching would have been obvious to organize the lane groups such that all of the lanes in each group lane are filled up with either command header bits or data bits, as the available bandwidth are dynamically reallocated.

To further address the arguments as presented above regarding Caldara:

- the arriving of data are in parallel, which is why the received data are arbitrated (Caldara, Fig. 6);
- the amount data bits transferred would obviously been variable, as the invention is associated with ATM network communication, and it is well known to one skill in the art that various types of data are transferred over the ATM network, including data such as video, audio, picture file or text file; and the transferring of these data are broken into fix cells for the ATM network, wherein the number of cells for the different types of data would obviously not be fix. For example, transferring a one minute of audio file would have different number of data cells as transferring a one minutes of video file;
- lastly, due to the different types of data with variable number of bits having different priority, the rate at which a corresponding allocated bandwidth is filled up would be different, such that if the corresponding allocated bandwidth for a connection has been completely used up, the connection can utilize the dynamic bandwidth by dynamically scheduling of momentarily unassigned bandwidth (col. 1, l. 64 to col. 2, l. 8; col. 4, ll. 25-28 and col. 7, ll. 10-18), therefore, the momentarily unassigned bandwidth (i.e. unused/unfilled bandwidth) which would have been caused by the different types of data with variable number of bits having different priority and the bandwidth is optimized as the momentarily unassigned bandwidth is dynamically scheduled to be filled.

In conclusion, the examiner believes that the various differences between AAPA and Caldara that are presented by the applicant are due to the difference in technology. As AAPA is associated to the transferring of data to/from system memory and Caldara is associated to transferring of data over an ATM network. Even with this different, both are attempting to solve the problem associated with bandwidth optimization by utilizing the unused/unfilled bandwidth.

In addressing the applicant arguments, the examiner will maintain his position and the current rejection of record.



**DONALD SPARKS**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER